Information Services Board (ISB) Meeting Minutes
John A. Cherberg Building, Hearing Room 4
Olympia, WA
November 25, 1996

Members Present:

Len McComb	Hunter Simpson (via teleconference)
Twyla Barnes	William Anderson
Ann Daley	Gary Robinson
Steve Kolodney	Ed Lazowska
Cathy Wolfe	John Franklin
William Finkbeiner	

Members Absent:	*Others Present:*
Mary McQueen	Todd Sander

Call to Order   Mr. McComb called the meeting to order.

Roll Call   Sufficient members were present to allow a quorum.

Approval of Minutes   The minutes from the October 30,1996 Information
                            Services Board (ISB) meeting were approved.

Consolidation of   Mr. Ralph Hegreness, Chairman of Technology
WSP & DOT Data Centers Management Group (TMG), presented the findings and
                            recommendations from a 1996 feasibility study
                            sponsored by the Legislative Transportation Committee
                            (LTC). The study, *Consolidation of Information
                            Technologies for Transportation Agencies,* examined
                            potential alternatives for cost savings and efficiencies in
                            three areas: data centers, voice/data communications and
                            microwave/mobile radio.

                            The study identified problems and risks of consolidation
                            of the Department of Transportation (DOT) and
                            Washington State Patrol (WSP) data centers. The results
                            of the study indicated the most feasible alternative was to
                            consolidate the two data centers into one using the DOT
                            facilities with a single computer for mainframe
                            processing.

                            TMG further recommended the microwave facilities be
                            consolidated and be managed by WSP. TMG showed
                            no cost benefit for consolidating mobile radio
                            communications and/or voice networks at this time.

                            A discussion of the capacity needed for the processor
                            followed. The vendor for the WSP mainframe
                            acquisition agreed to downsize the processor, so that it is
                            classified as a smaller model group to reduce software
                            costs. Mr. Hegreness emphasized this model is easy to
                            scale up, to handle new projects such as LAMP or meet
                            increased capacity requirements if the Department of

Corrections (DOC) does not move from the WSP to the DIS data center.

Mr. McComb stated the Board must make a set of interrelated decisions which affect the capacity needed at the DOT data center and understanding the implications of this is important.

Transfer of the WSP Mainframe to DOT

Mr. Mike Stack, DIS, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Information Technology Oversight (OITO), introduced Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Sid Morrison and Mr. Satish Ajmani, Chief of Information Management Systems, DOT. At the October 30, 1996 meeting the ISB directed DOT to present a financial analysis detailing the net impact of DOT taking possession of the mainframe recently acquired by the Washington State Patrol.

Mr. Ajmani explained the business drivers for replacing the current DOT mainframe. DOT would reduce maintenance costs by using newer technology. Furthermore, the Open Systems Adapter would provide improved connectivity to the mainframe and more efficient data transfer.

Mr. Ajmani described several possible acquisition alternatives. DOT calculated that they would save approximately $600,000 over five years by replacing their current mainframe with one using complementary metal-oxide semiconductor (CMOS) technology. Mr. Morrison stated the formation of the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) passed by voters in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties in the November 5, 1996 election would further increase DOT's need for expanded computer capacity. If DOT replaced the current mainframe with the one acquired by WSP it would cost DOT $1.75 to $2.2 million. Those costs would be offset by potential savings of $4.5 million through the consolidation of the DOT and WSP data centers. Mr. Ajmani also informed the Board of an IBM proposal to reduce the hardware and software costs for the new WSP computer by $500,000. The initial capacity mainframe would be reduced and additional capacity would be added as necessary.

The Board approved DOT's purchase of the computer contracted by WSP, in a reduced configuration, to be installed at the DOT data center.

Transfer of DOC data processing from WSP to the DIS Data Center

Mr. Scott Chapman, DIS Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Information Technology Oversight (OITO), introduced Secretary of the Department of Corrections, Chase Riveland, who presented a proposal to transfer the

Department of Corrections (DOC) data processing workload from the Washington State Patrol (WSP) data center to the Department of Information Services (DIS) data center.

The mission critical system for DOC, Offender-Based Tracking System (OBTS) has been operating at the WSP data center since 1990. Mr. Riveland explained the growth in the system which contains about 278,000 offender files with 628,000 names (including aliases). Because of performance and capacity constraints the OBTS system needs to be re-engineered. A study was conducted by Anderson Consulting which suggested a new architecture, a two-tiered centralized server environment. Such an architecture would improve the user interface and meet growing needs for connectivity to other criminal justice systems, such as Administrator for the Courts and Justice Information Network (JIN).

Mr. Riveland proposed that DOC move its data processing workload to the DIS data center on July 1, 1997.

Mr. William Anderson recommended waiting on a decision to move until decisions were made by the Legislature about the consolidation study for the DOT and WSP data centers. Mr. McComb indicated that such a decision would depend upon action taken by the Legislature in the 1997 Legislative Transportation Budget.

Mr. McComb said the Board will further discuss cost comparisons and analysis of alternatives at subsequent meetings.

Audit of the LAMP Project

Mr. Ralph Hegreness, Chairman of Technology Management Group (TMG), presented TMG's findings from the reassessment of the Licensing Application Migration Project (LAMP) titled , *Assessment of the LAMP Project for State of Washington Information Services Board.* The first assessment, *LAMP Assessment Phase 1*, was presented to the Board in May 1996. He stated the second report's objectives were to look at the project's progress since May 1996, project status, and to suggest modifications to plans, schedules and budgets. The assessment team consisted of six members who reviewed all available project documentation, including schedule and budget history.

Mr. Hegreness said significant benefits have been achieved as a result of the efforts to create a fully integrated project plan. Companion projects such as the driver's license examining system, LITE, are being integrated into the LAMP project plan via the same

project management tool. Resource scheduling is also being added to the project plans. He said most of the six month contingency has been used and the schedule showing implementation in May 1997 is optimistic.

The original LAMP budget was for $67 million and it is now predicted to be $82.8 million, an increase of 22 percent. Through August 1996, $34.2 million has been spent, the bulk of which has been used for application development.

The TMG audit consisted of 5 recommendations: Suspend all planning on Releases 2 and 3 (Release 2 is vehicles, Release 3 is vessels); strongly consider moving most of LITE back into LAMP; seek more commitment of the major vendor, DMR;   expect and plan for an additional delay in Release 1 implementation if LITE is included in LAMP; and
consider certain network design changes.

LAMP Project Status

Ms. Lourdes Collins, DIS Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Information Technology Oversight (OITO), introduced Department of Licensing (DOL) Director Ms. Kathy Baros Friedt to present DOL's response to the recommendations of the TMG reassessment. Ms. Friedt agreed suspending Release 3, vessels, was a good recommendation. She also said Release 2 is essential to achieving the department's goal to "build a client system." However, the department agreed that Release 2 needs to be de-coupled from Release 1 and reassessed before proceeding. She defined de-couple as proceeding with Release 2 sequentially rather than concurrently with Release 1. She stated it is too early to make a decision about whether to move LITE into LAMP. Only high-level cost estimates were available. DOL is considering extending its contract with DMR per recommendation three. She agreed with recommendations four and five. DOL will begin planning for additional delay in Release 1 implementation and consider network design changes.

A discussion of the LITE project and how it could be scaled down and included in LAMP followed. It was suggested that DOL cut out the office support function and complete the core business function as designed. Mr. Dan Hill, LAMP project manager, said the core of LITE could be done by the end of spring or early summer. Mr. McComb requested the financial information on the infrastructure costs elsewhere in the agency attributable to LITE and staffing costs associated with LAMP and LITE that are not reflected in the LAMP or LITE budgets.

Mr. McComb moved that the Board instruct the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and DIS to construct a new Project Agreement which will:

1. De-couple Release 1 from subsequent Releases 2 and 3, redirect contractual resources to the development of Release 1 and an alternative that would enable Release 1 into production in the simplest possible configuration at the earliest possible time. This Release 1 alternative should be developed and both the baseline and the alternative should be presented to the Legislature and the ISB before Release 1 is put in production.

2. Develop and plan to integrate LAMP and LITE into a single application and project and recommend to the Legislature and the ISB a process and timetable to contract for the development and maintenance of the LAMP/LITE application.

3. Reassess the technology assumptions upon which the LAMP/LITE architecture has been built and recommend alternatives that reduce complexity and cost of ownership.

4. Ask the Legislature and incoming administration to re-evaluate goals, business requirements and alternatives for the development of LAMP as an investment decision during the 1997 legislative session.

Sen. Finkbeiner suggested the Board delete the portion of the motion which allows the status quo continuation of Release 1. He suggested an amendment requiring that work be stopped on Release 2 and a catalog of what has been done on Release 2 be presented to the Board at the next ISB meeting. Board members spoke in opposition to stopping Release 2 since it was not known what the contractual penalties would be. Sen. Finkbeiner's amendment failed to pass with three in favor and seven opposed.

Mr. Gary Robinson commented that he would prefer to continue work with Release 1, don't go any further coding Release 2 and stop all work on Release 3. Mr. McComb accepted Mr. Robinson's amendment.

Sen. Finkbeiner amended Mr. McComb's motion saying he thought all work should be stopped on Release 1 until the Legislature makes a decision.

The question was called on the Finkbeiner amendment. The amendment failed with a vote of one in favor, nine opposed.

Two friendly amendments were added to the original motion by Mr. McComb listed above.

5. Include LAMP, LITE and all the companion projects under the new LAMP project agreement.

6. Stop all work on Release 3.

The motion including the friendly amendments was adopted on a vote of nine to one.

Remaining Agenda Items   Remaining agenda items were deferred until the next meeting.

New Business   None.

Adjournment   The meeting was adjourned.